

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated 9/17/2008. Claims 1-8 and 25-32 are pending. Claims 1-8 and 25-32 are rejected. No claims have been amended, added, or cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-8 and 25-32 remain pending in the present application.

Rejection under 35 USC 103

Claims 1-8 and 25-32 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakalash et al. (US 2002/0029207) further in view of Lore et al (US 2002/0099691).

Claims 1 and 25

The invention, as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 25, provide a method and code with instructions for aggregating a plurality of entries in a table in a database management system into an aggregated entry in the table or another table in the database management system. The aggregating comprises making the aggregated entry. The aggregated entry represents the plurality of entries. The entry also includes a field whose value is a representation of a set of individual members. The individual members are derived from values contained in entries belonging to the plurality of entries. The representation specifies the individual members of the set. Thus, the invention preserves the individual members in the field of the aggregated entry by specifying the individual members in the representation.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Bakalash does not disclose the aggregated entry “as argued by the applicant”. In the Amendment filed 6/12/2008, Applicant argued that in contrast with the recited invention, the aggregated entry in Bakalash does not preserve or specify the raw data. With the recited invention, since the aggregated entry preserves or specifies the individual members of the set, the depth of hierarchy is reduced as compared to Bakalash. The recited aggregated entry also makes it easier to drill down to view the raw data as compared to Bakalash.

In the present office action, the Examiner cites Lore as teaching this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner points to paragraphs 35-39 and 68-71 of Lore. However, here Lore discloses a relation list (Fig. 4) as an indexing scheme wherein relevant aggregate buckets can be accessed for a given transaction. Paragraphs 68-71 discuss the relation list in

detail. The relation list 18, shown in Fig. 4 of Lore, contains three fields: aggregate level code, aggregate key, and detail key. The aggregate level code is an arbitrary integral number which identifies the aggregation level (paragraph 69). The aggregate key is a dimension key used to represent that aggregate (paragraph 70). The detail key is a key for the detail input data (paragraph 71). However, none of these fields contain the aggregated entry as recited in claims 1 and 25. More specifically, the aggregate level code is not a representation of a set of individual members derived from values contained entries belonging to the plurality of the entries; the aggregate key does not specify individual members of the set that makes up the aggregate; and the detail key does not represent a set of individual members.

In summary, Lore does not disclose an aggregate entry that: includes a field whose value is a representation of a *set* of individual members, the individual members being derived from values contained in entries belonging to the plurality of the entries, *and* the representation *specifies the individuals members of the set*. Lore instead discloses a series of aggregate entries in a relation list, where each aggregate entry neither represents a set of individual members nor specifies the individual members of the set.

For these reasons, Bakalash in view of Lore fails to teach or suggest the invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 25. Claims 1 and 25 are thus allowable over Bakalash in view of Lore.

Claims 2-8 and 26-32

Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-8 and 26-32 are also allowable over Bakalash because they depend upon allowable base claims 1 and 25.

Additionally, the dependent claims set forth limitations which are not disclosed in Bakalash in view of Lore, and are consequently patentable in their own rights over the references.

Claims 2 and 26 recite the further step/instruction: deleting the plurality of entries represented by the aggregated entry. The Examiner admits in the rejection of claim 1 that Bakalash does not disclose the aggregate entry as argued by the Applicant. It thus follows that Bakalash also does not disclose the aggregate entry recited in claims 2 and 26. Further, in her rejection, Examiner refers Applicants to paragraphs [0216] and [0258]. [0216] refers to items of a "work list" that are deleted after they are processed.

[0214] makes it clear that the items on the work list are copies of items on an ordered list of items; the deletion of an item on the work list thus has no effect on the ordered list of items or on the actual sources of the ordered list. [0258] discusses FIG. 22, which discloses an embodiment in which an RDBMS is a component of a data warehouse system. There is absolutely nothing in [0258] concerning deletion of data from tables. Thus, neither [0216] nor [0258] discloses the added limitation and claims 2 and 26 are patentable in their own rights over the references.

Claims 3-6 and 27-30 set forth further limitations concerning claim 1 and claim 26's limitation of the "representation specifying individual members of the set". Since Bakalash in view of Lore does not disclose the recited representation, as set forth above, the reference cannot disclose the further limitations of the representation and these claims as well are patentable in their own rights over the reference.

Conclusion

Accordingly, claims 1-8 and 25-32 are patentable over the cited references. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and passage to issue of these claims as now presented.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any additional fees required for the amendment or refund any overpayments to deposit account number 501315.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michele Baillie/
Michele Baillie
Gordon E. Nelson, Patent Attorney, P.C.
57 Central St., P.O. Box 782
Rowley, MA 01969
Registration number 44,875
Voice: (978) 948-7632
Fax: (866)-723-0359
12/3/2008
Date